

Jürgen Hanneder, *To Edit or Not to Edit: On Textual Criticism of Sanskrit Works. A series of lectures delivered at the École Pratique des Hautes Études Paris, March 2015, and the Department of Pali, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, October and November 2015.* [Pune Indological Series 1]. Pune: Aditya Prakashan, 2017. xiii, 231 pp., ISBN 978-81-77-42164-4. INR 1200,00 / \$32.75.

Excellent and thoughtful guides to the practice of philology have long been available, not a few of which were written in, or have been translated into, English. But to my knowledge, all or almost all of these take as their subject the philology of Latin and Greek.<sup>1</sup> For Indology, however, the situation is much less robust, and in this respect scholars and students would no doubt find two types of guidebook most welcome: First, some introduction to the issues raised by Indic (in principle, ideally non-Vedic Sanskrit) textual criticism, aimed at an audience well-aware of the generalities of the field, but not well informed about its application to other literatures; and second, a guidebook for students of Sanskrit to introduce them to text criticism and philology on the basis of materials closer to those they are actually going to encounter. One attempt at the latter type of work might consist in something like a reworking of the excellent guides of Maas or West, replacing their primarily Latin examples with texts drawn from Sanskrit sources. While its author may not have had any such goal in mind, the volume under review here does not meet either of these desiderata, and unfortunately one would be hard put to see what audience it indeed did envisage, or what its aims were, given its scattered nature and lack of focus.

The volume *To Edit or Not to Edit* is very elegantly designed (it brings to my mind an Italian aesthetic), and printed on excellent paper; physically this is one of the nicest non-art books I have seen from India.<sup>2</sup> It is a great pity, then, that this is perhaps the most positive thing that I can say about the volume.

As the subtitle of the book makes clear, it presents lectures delivered first in Paris, and then in much expanded form, as the Preface states (p. ix), in Pune. The author articulates his goal as demonstrating “through a series of examples, the value of editorial philology, one not conceived as the menial task of producing printed editions of texts, but as a very basic way to communicate with

1 I am aware also of parallel works for Hebrew, Sumerian and Akkadian, and no doubt there are others as well, but I think these are generally not well known or widely read by scholars outside those fields. See now also Alessandro Bausi et al., eds., *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies: An Introduction*, an Open Access publication of Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies, 2015, and in particular its third chapter, “Textual criticism and text editing,” pp. 321–465.

2 I cannot understand, however, why new sections begin on the verso rather than, as is the norm, the recto. This makes a strange impression.

the thought world of authors of texts.” (pp. ix–x). As is evident from this formulation, the author (hereafter JH) has a rather poor opinion of most previous editors of, in particular, Sanskrit texts. He concentrates most but certainly not all of his attention, in terms of the examples upon which he draws, on Sanskrit materials from Kashmir, a choice which of course needs no justification. His passion for the Sanskrit literature of Kashmir is evident, and if nothing else, that this volume might draw attention to this material would be a positive thing. JH laments that despite the efforts he is making in Marburg, where he is professor (and where most of his PhD students seem to work on Kashmiri materials), reforms in the system of higher education in Europe through the introduction of a BA/MA system have “made it almost impossible to train new editors.” (p. xii). He does not explain how his lectures might contribute to addressing this problem.

The book is divided unevenly into three sections: The Unknown World of Inedita (47 pp., with 3 subsections); How to Edit (141 pp., with 12 subsections); and Editing Sāhib Kaul’s Works (31 pp., with 5 subsections). No rationale is offered for the organization of the book, which skips without any detectable logic from one topic to another.

In view of the locations at which these lectures were offered, they must be judged in the first place on the way in which they would most likely be accessible to an audience of, respectively, French and Indian students. What, then, in the first place, is one to make of the numerous passages quoted without translation (the list here is not exhaustive) in Spanish (pp. 2–3), French (p. 152), Latin (pp. 7, 128, 129), German (pp. 8, 11n35, 15n47, 16n48, 67n30, 108n153, 132, 174), and Sanskrit (pp. 20, 31–32, 63, 86, 147, 223–226)? It is odd that perhaps an equal number of times, passages in these languages (save the Spanish) are indeed translated, although these English translations are sometimes unidiomatic and occasionally even ungrammatical, as is the main text itself. No pattern is evident for the choice to translate or not, and while in some past era it might have been possible to imagine that French students could construe Latin and German, does the author expect this of his audience in Pune? In terms, then, of an ability even to understand the basic words on the page, for whom, exactly, did JH intend this book, and what sort of thought did he give to the question whether this audience could follow his discussions even linguistically?

The author is a well-known scholar of Sanskrit, with considerable experience in editing, and therefore he no doubt has much of interest to say. And there are certainly points of interest throughout the book, particularly in the first section, revisited in section 3, in discussions which concentrate on the largely ignored area of modern Kashmiri Sanskrit; the concluding “Résumé” (228–229) dwells exclusively on this topic. Despite the possible interest of these sections,

the first and third, I will concentrate my attentions on the portion which makes up the bulk of the book, its second section.

Divided into 12 subsections, it begins with "European Textual Criticism." On the second page of this section, as the topic is just being set out, our hapless reader, a member of the audience to which JH delivered these lectures, trained perhaps to read Sanskrit in Pune and expecting, we might guess, a tutorial in European editorial technique, finds the following (pp. 52–53):

The early text-critical approaches of editors of Greek and Latin works are comparatively well-studied. We know that the second-century author and critic Galen was aware of the fact that the author's exemplar might have contained errors, that these were corrected only by later generations, that an easy text might have been merely one simplified by later generations, that an emendation has to take into account the genesis of error, in other words text-critical observations that have remained valid. There are other authors in the first centuries of the Christian era, who are already aware of the principles of *lectio difficilior*, the more difficult variant reading that has to be retained against simplifications, and of the *consuetudo* (usage). It is therefore held that in the first centuries A.D. the best scholars in Europe practised a kind of textual criticism. In late antiquity the care of texts was in the hands of nobility but especially of monks and monasteries. Some newly founded monastic denominations as the Benedictines made room in their daily schedule for philological work and the copying of texts. Some Christian editors had reservations about non-Christian, pagan works, which were consequently neglected, but some English and especially Irish monks held no such prejudices. They collected and preserved these pre- or non-Christian works, thus some of the early Roman and Greek authors were reintroduced in central Europe from the North. Around 800 at the court of Charlemagne, a large corpus of Latin and Greek works was known.

I honestly do not know what our reader would make of this. To take just one case, if our reader has heard of Galen at all, he knows him as a physician, not a text critic, something Galen is not terribly famous for.<sup>3</sup> How, moreover, is each sentence here meant to logically connect to the next? The sudden mention of Latin technical terms without meaningful explanation cannot help but baffle,

3 JH provides no information, but one might see Franco Montanari, "Ekdomosis. A Product of the Ancient Scholarship," in Franco Montanari, Stefanos Matthaios, Antonios Rengakos, eds., *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden: Brill, 2015: 664–665.

and I expect that our Indian student would be unable to make much of this. One who knows this material can contextualize it while reading, but I imagine that a beginner would feel like a deer in headlights.

JH goes on in a similarly terse fashion to mention options for editing, including various approaches to emendation. He is no fan, quite obviously, of the “best text” approach, which he mentions as follows (p. 59):

There are psychologically understandable, but ultimately irrational methods to deal with multiple readings. For instance one may, after reading some part of the text in the manuscripts, get the impression that, for instance, manuscript A is the “best manuscript.” This may in certain cases even hold true statistically, but it becomes a problem when we use this impression to predict correctness, when we start to believe in the “best” manuscript and then blindly follow it. We may compare the selection of readings to a court case. The editor as judge may be used to finding the case of the prosecution quite convincing, but by not even listening to the defendant he is likely to make wrong decisions. Similarly no best manuscript should ever be believed. But it is also obvious that editors use this as a practical shortcut, when other criteria fail.

An equally dangerous method is to follow the best manuscript whenever it makes good sense and to consider other manuscripts’ readings only when there is blatant error. This inevitably leads to a superficial edition, in which many original readings will be missed.

I find it hard to follow exactly what JH has in mind here, since at least serious editors do not approach texts in this way, “blindly” following anything. (I admit that there are, and maybe will always be, unqualified editors, those who are simply bad at their jobs, but I doubt it is necessary to spend time theorizing about them.) It is perhaps a slightly different matter that an editor may choose to follow a single manuscript except when it produces nonsense, but this need not lead to a superficial edition; everything depends on the history of the text, the manuscript tradition, and a determination of the nature, and possible existence, of “original readings.” JH’s presentation misses the opportunity to discuss this. He is also, without to my mind adequately acknowledging the diversity of different kinds of literature, almost single-mindedly focused on texts for which he believes he can establish an original or Ur-text, this determining to an overwhelming degree his overall attitude toward editing.

The main problem of the book as a whole is precisely the sort of lack of logical continuity which one can see in the passages cited above. But it is hard to convey in a review the larger picture of this logical incoherence, since it occurs

on the macro scale, with the result that even I, as a reader already broadly familiar with the topic, can often not follow why one subject is connected with another. This incoherence may in part be attributed to the manner in which the book was compiled which, deploying the kinds of philological tools JH rightly advocates, we might in broad strokes discern from several features which occur throughout.

Something of the process of preparation of these lectures might be deduced by the fact that many references appear first in an abbreviated form, their full form appearing only later, if ever. This suggests that rather than being composed serially, disparate materials were spliced together in an order different from that which they originally had, but this integration was not done carefully. Since the book has no bibliography, one must hunt in the notes for full references. When on p. 73 JH refers to “the often quoted article by Housman,” it will be possible to understand this, if at all, only 50 pages later, when on p. 123n206 one finds a citation, but even then, the reader must be able to make the connection.<sup>4</sup> I have not made a survey of all the references in the book, but for example on p. 80n80 are listed three family names and dates without any further reference to the publications intended; on p. 81n87 we find reference to “Alexis Sanderson, ‘The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir,’ p. 399 f.,” but while we elsewhere find reference (e.g., p. 146n270) to other works of the same author, as far as I see, we never find the actual reference to the publication in question;<sup>5</sup> on p. 89n107 is a reference to van Vliet, found fully only on p. 100n138. Sometimes no references are felt necessary; ZDMG rests unexplained (e.g. p. 99n132, etc.), and we find, without any explanation, (p. 141n250) “Monier-Williams does not even record it.” On p. 117 in a quotation from Oldenberg we find “Bloomfield’s concordance,” without anywhere any explanation of what this might be; as obvious as it will be to specialists, I suppose students may be baffled. Referring to Zachariae’s edition of the *Mañkhakośa*, after reference to the 1899 edition we find “[= Kl. Schr. 387–440].” Again, what can our Indian reader make of this? Sometimes, on the other hand, almost successive notes record the same bibliographic information (pp. 108–109nn153, 156). Such examples could, unfortunately, be multiplied.<sup>6</sup> An uncomfortable number of references could hardly

4 The reference on p. 101n140 cites the article, but in the text itself we find only “Or phrased in typical Housman polemics” before the quotation. Thus, neither the reference on p. 101 nor that on p. 123 would help the reader who attempts to trace the reference on p. 73.

5 It appeared in Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, eds., *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d’Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*. Pondicherry: Institut français d’Indologie / Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient, 2007: 231–442 and (bibliography) pp. 551–582.

6 For instance, in a quotation from Witzel on p. 104 we find, entirely unexplained, KS, JB,

be located by a student; as a single example, on p. 105n148 an article by David Shulman in the *New York Review of Books* is cited only as “LXII.1”; no year or page is given. Mostly only the place of publication of books is listed, but sometimes only the publisher is listed, sometimes both. Rather often no pages are cited, so a reader would be forced to search for the source of a citation. On p. 109n155 JH refers to “a letter to A.W. Schlegel of May 1844” from Max Müller; no further details are provided. On p. 113 JH cites a footnote of Max Müller, but gives no further information about where this might be found.<sup>7</sup> (JH incidentally refers several times to *mokṣamūlara*, once p. 113 in the compound *mokṣamūlaraśākhā*, then p. 119 as *mokṣamūlarabhaṭṭa*. I am not sure who coined this name for Max Müller, nor do I know whether the compound forms exist outside of JH’s book, but if this is meant as other than a sly inside joke, I do not see that it could be easily understood.) On p. 121, reference is made to “two misreadings of Müller and one true variant,” but one has to go back to a note on the previous page, p. 120n195, to find out what this variant is.

One might conclude from the clues offered above that JH has compiled his book hastily from notes, and simply not bothered either to reread it himself, or ask anyone else to do so either. Certainly he, a native speaker of German, has not had any English native speaker check his language, which is rife with unidiomatic and sometimes even ungrammatical expressions.<sup>8</sup> Some are not so serious: comma splices, for instance, are common.<sup>9</sup> Relative pronouns produce problems more than once: on p. 80 we find: “Often it is accompanied by Kṣemarāja’s commentary, who is the third in a line of religious trans-

---

VādhB. Witzel’s article itself did offer a table of abbreviations in which the relevant sigla are explained, but JH makes no reference to this.

- 7 The answer is that it occurs on p. xliii of the English translation of *Vedic Hymns*, published by Max Müller in 1891, the only previous references to which on pp. 112–113 of JH’s book are to pages 31 and 43, i.e., nowhere near page xliii.
- 8 Trivial examples: p. 207 “Does Indian love lyrics describe true emotion or is it a literary imagination?” On the previous page, in English the name of the author of the line *homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto* is Terence, not Terenz, as in German. The untranslated line means “I am human, I consider nothing human alien to me.” Sloppiness is evident on p. 208 with “Before following Franco into some details and identify problems of his approach ....” A rather more extreme example (p. 104): “If we want to see how such an argumentation would look like, we only need to read a book that appeared also in Oxford only few decades later, namely Grierson and Barnett’s edition of the sayings of the Kashmirian Saint Lallā, which are based on an oral text as well as on a differing written version.”
- 9 One example (p. 75) reads: “An editor who uses stemmatics may not want to accept that these things exist, many classical scholars expect a good writer to work like Horace told his pupil in his *Ars Poetica*, to publish only when the work has come to perfection, show it to no one before and never change one’s mind afterwards.”

mission from the author," which does not make sense as written, but can be sussed out; on p. 101 we see: "In an article [...] P.K. Gode quotes from the manuscript of Madhavācārya's commentary on the *Mahābhārata* (BORI 275 of 1892–1895), who comes to this diagnosis." BORI, by the way, is never explained, and no explanation is given for what is evidently a reference to the manuscript. The reader eager to follow up is left without assistance. Some sentences are extremely difficult to construe, such as one on p. 96: "Editors also mention their sources—in the absence of library catalogues we cannot expect more than general adjectives to describe these codices—, or the fact that they have collected manuscripts from different areas, as Nilakaṇṭha, the commentator on the *Mahābhārata*." Sometimes the author's translations from German are unidiomatic (p. 137): "Through theoretical doubts the work that is already difficult, is only complicated further," rendering "Durch theoretische Zweifel verwirrt man die an sich schwierige Arbeit nur noch mehr." It is at least curious that the online translation tool deepL.com offers a much better rendering: "Theoretical doubts only confuse the difficult work even more." Other similar examples might be cited (e.g., p. 143). Sometimes the author simply writes what emerges as nonsense (pp. 150–151): "Here a mechanical criterium, as for instance a stemma produced by whatever method, in the worst case a best manuscript would be a relief, unless one wants to roll a dice with manuscripts sigla for numbers." The fact that dice is plural is here the very least of the problems.

JH is sometimes unable to reproduce his sources correctly, in ways which interestingly mirror some of the issues he himself recognizes in Indic manuscripts: on p. 93 he quotes Kosambi as saying that the value of a manuscript is "inversely proportional to the fuzz made in lending it," but I seriously doubt that frizzy masses of hair, or the police, are involved here; rather, we find an incorrect voicing, not caught by a scribe who is insufficiently careful and/or familiar with the language he was copying.

The bulk of the examples referred to by the author are drawn from texts upon which he has worked, and his expertise here is not in doubt. But when he ventures outside his core expertise, he sometimes goes astray factually. JH writes (p. 153): "There are many examples that after the publication of an edition new materials appear that cast serious doubt on the correctness of the text, and necessitate a revision. One particularly spectacular case is the recovery of an older version of the "Urtext" of Lao Zi in 1993, which leads to the conclusion that Lao Zi was not the historical person one has long imagined, but—if we want to speak of an author at all—a later redactor of a collection of sayings." Whatever JH may have read in the book to which he refers (unavailable to me) by Wolfgang Kubin (Freiburg, 2011), I am not aware of any serious scholar who ever thought of Laozi (it should not be written as if it were two words) as a histori-

cal person; who has “long imagined” this I cannot imagine. The date to which JH refers, 1993, indicates—though he does not bother to say so—that the text he has in mind is that of the late 4th c. BCE Guodian (郭店) manuscripts, concerning which William Boltz has written:<sup>10</sup> “It is entirely reasonable [...] as well as technically correct from a text-critical perspective to call the Mawangdui silk manuscripts [discovered in 1973—JAS] of the *Laozi* “the *Laozi*.” The *Laozi* parallels found in the late fourth-century B.C. Guodian manuscripts, by contrast, differ substantially enough from the received text that there is no objectively sound textual basis for calling these passages “the *Laozi*.” They appear instead to constitute a part of the kind of “source materials” or textual “building blocks” out of which the *Laozi* was compiled sometime in the third century B.C.” Note that Boltz is not asserting that the version from Mawangdui is the *Laozi*’s Urtext, only that the Guodian text should not even be thought of as the same text at all; it is not “the *Laozi*.” Now, this is surely a controversial topic, and some scholars appear to disagree with Boltz. Moreover, JH is obviously no Sinologist, and we cannot expect him to adjudicate the issue. However, it would not have been difficult for him to determine that there exists a controversy, and that therefore his apodictic presentation was misguided.

Pp. 90ff. offer a brief version of what JH earlier published in German concerning the opening verses of what he repeatedly calls the *Vimśatikā* of Vasubandhu (the title is rather *Vimśikā*). JH relates that when he read this text he used a Polish edition of 1999, and that, with his students, “since none of us could read Polish, we altogether missed the fact that the first two verses—although given in the edition in Sanskrit—are not actually transmitted in Sanskrit.” He goes on however to note that indeed when he checked Lévi’s edition he discovered that these verses were a reconstruction, and he concludes that (p. 91) “The example is mainly given to show what critical philologists know well: if one makes the effort to investigate the sources for oneself, the outcome may be quite unexpected.” One certainly cannot argue with this. But why would one make use of an edition the apparatus of which one cannot understand, and is it then really surprising that one might miss key information? And just what are the sources? JH refers to the additional manuscript containing only the verses, which he at first overlooked, and to the Tibetan translation, but he makes no mention whatsoever of the three Chinese translations of this text. Evidently these are not “sources” for him. His considerations in the end led him to the following (p. 93):

10 William G. Boltz, “Reading Early Chinese Manuscripts.” *Journal of Chinese Studies* 47 (2007): 463–464.



[T]here were obviously two versions of the *Vimśatikā*, one Kārikā version and one Saṃṛtti version, both complete as far as the content are concerned, but differing in one verse. One likely explanation would be that the commented version is the original, but when one wanted to transmit the Kārikās separately, the main philosophical proposition, which was formulated in prose, would have been missing and so this was made into an additional verse, our verse 1. Only in Lévi's edition this verse, which fits only in the Kārikā version, was added to the commented version, thus producing a *Vimśatikā* with 22 verses and an ahistorical conflated text. Here the Tibetan translators who preserved both versions separately were text-critically more far-sighted.

As I have discussed the matter in my edition of the *Vimśikā*, which may have been unknown to JH, I simply refer here to that discussion.<sup>11</sup> Suffice it to say here that basically JH's presentation is not well informed.

JH has a serious bone to pick with Max Müller, whose edition of the *Ṛgveda* he seems to find utterly unacceptable. In a confusing discussion, he apparently finds it impossible to accept that the text of the *Ṛgveda* was transmitted without actual variants, despite the fact that he quotes Georg Bühler as writing, a propos a manuscript JH criticizes Müller for not using (p. 111), "I have not found any readings which I should like to declare to be real *variae lectiones*." Nowhere in his discussion does JH mention the manner of transmission of the text, in which its literal form is, most scholars seem to agree, virtually guaranteed above all through the use of different forms of *pāṭhas* (*sarṅhitā*, *pada*, *krama*, and the *vikṛtis*, complicated inversions), all of which are designed precisely to prevent corruptions entering the text as it is transmitted orally. The written transmission and the oral agree almost without exception, certifying each other, but JH is not convinced. He characterizes (p. 107) Müller's textual criticism of the *Ṛgveda* as "a topsy-turvy world," saying, "In this world the correct text is not something to be established, it is established before textual criticism begins, not despite, but because of the intervention of later generations of transmitters. In other words, everything we have learned from textual criticism is valued differently here." He is very critical (p. 112) that Müller did not consider South Indian manuscripts, writing that:

11 Jonathan A. Silk, *Materials Toward the Study of Vasubandhu's Vimśikā (I): Sanskrit and Tibetan Critical Editions of the Verses and Autocommentary. An English Translation and Annotations*. [Harvard Oriental Series 81]. Cambridge MA: Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University, 2016. Open Access edition 2018: 149–152.

one gets the impression that he did not want to complicate his work with these new materials and tried all sorts of arguments to ward them off. For instance, he says that there was one Grantha manuscript that did contain “a few independent various readings, such as are found in all MSS., and owe their origin clearly to the jottings of individual students.” While it is quite understandable that such a large work would have been considerably delayed, if not made impossible if the manuscript base had been extended, Müller tries to shut his eyes in the face of the variation found in manuscripts. He uses a simple rhetorical trick to deny that these are variants in the real sense of the word, with the hope that readers would not notice.

I leave aside the supernatural power of JH, who is able to read the mind of the long dead Max Müller. The question is what JH thinks an edition should do. On the following page (p. 113), JH accuses Müller of “claiming that there were no variants.” But this is not true; rather, what Müller claimed is that these “variants” are errors, and to be removed. The real argument between JH and Max Müller is that the former thinks an edition should present an exhaustive catalogue of the manuscript evidence, even when it is evidently wrong. To be sure, one can learn much from such evidence, but what one cannot learn is what the author of a text meant to say, something that JH himself (see above) evidently considers the goal of textual criticism. I cannot avoid the conclusion that JH would not be content with any edition that does not allow a mapping of the transmission history of a text, perhaps because he does not trust the choices made by editors, which in itself is a very reasonable stance. And such an edition is likewise not a bad thing, and no one is in favor of an edition which does not accurately represent the available evidence, but JH’s book is filled with far too many straw men, who produced editions of classic texts that JH finds wanting. One feels driven to ask whether perhaps JH’s next project will be a new edition of the *R̥gveda*, taking account of all manuscripts and oral transmissions. It will be interesting to see how his results would differ from the editions we now have.<sup>12</sup>

A curious portion of the book concerns the *Cittānubodhaśāstra*. On p. 157 JH cites the first verse, and then the next two, from “Stanislav Jager’s edition,”

12 A propos Max Müller and the *R̥gveda*, on p. 115 JH refers to the life experiences of Isidor Isaac Scheftelowitz (1875–1934), the editor of the *R̥gveda Khila*. No source for these details is provided (but more information can be found at <http://zflprojekte.de/sprachforscher-im-exil/index.php/catalog/s/408-scheftelowitz-isidor>). In this context it is perhaps of interest to note that the distinguished scholar of Greek and Etruscan archaeology Brian Shefton was his son (born Bruno Scheftelowitz; 1919–2012).

but hunting for a reference one finds it only on p. 160m18, learning there that the text was edited in a PhD dissertation. This was subsequently published, a year after the publication of JH's book.<sup>13</sup> JH quotes the text in the 1990 edition of Pandey, and then the corrections in Jager's edition, based on a manuscript in Śāradā script. Among the peculiarities here is that almost precisely the same discussion here given by JH, with translation of the first verse, is found in Jager's book, based on his dissertation (in German), but nowhere does JH (who supervised the thesis) mention either that the materials presented here represent the work of Jager, nor on the contrary does Jager in his 2018 publication, which mentions JH's book in its bibliography, notice that JH has treated the same verses (on pp. x–xii). Something is a bit funny here; whose intellectual effort is presented here? If it is Jager's, as one might expect, JH has failed to make that clear. Furthermore, it is at the very least ironic, if not more, that while JH provides (p. 158) photos of the Śāradā manuscript,<sup>14</sup> some of the key points of discussion are utterly illegible in the photographs (such as *dhṛtvā* in 1.1). The discussion (p. 160) of 1.3 hardly makes sense without consulting Jager's own discussion.

Sometimes I am extremely hard put to understand why a certain topic found a place in this book at all. JH enters (p. 180 ff.), for instance, into a discussion of the so-called New Philology, the relation of which to his discussion in this section, and elsewhere, is not at all clear. Similarly, the discussion (p. 206 ff.) of the debate between Lambert Schmithausen and, chiefly, Eli Franco over the relation between Buddhist theoretical structures and meditation comes out of the blue, and aside from contributing nothing to the debate, does not seem to belong in the chapter on "Editing Sāhib Kaul's Works" at all, although JH tries to make a connection with a concern in some of Sāhib Kaul's texts with religious experience. One somehow gains the impression that JH simply had something to say about this, and found a place to say it.

More examples could be given to further substantiate the criticisms offered above, but I trust that the point has been made. This is a poor book, which shows little evidence that its author considered his audience important enough to edit properly, assure coherence of thought or word, proofread, provide proper and traceable references, and so on. Perhaps he took his own title too

13 Stanislav Jager, *Bhāskaraṅṅhas Cittānubodhaśāstra: Kritische Edition der ersten drei Kapitel nebst Erstedition des Autokommentars*. Indica et Tibetica 58. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2018.

14 This is the manuscript called "B" by Jager, but JH quotes only its abbreviated references, and nowhere mentions folio numbers, nor does he connect the transcriptions/editions with the photos he prints.

literally, and opted “Not to Edit.” This is not a polite thing to say, but especially in light of the attitude JH displays for those whose scholarship he finds wanting (occasionally bordering, I would say, on contempt), I think it is not out of line. If the series carries on past this inaugural volume, as it should, I hope that the editors will assure that their future contributors do a better job.

*Jonathan A. Silk*  
Leiden University  
*j.a.silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl*